## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 19-CR-117-WMC

ADRIAN C. GARDINER,

Madison, Wisconsin

June 15, 2021

Defendant. 1:14 p.m.

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE SENTENCING HELD BEFORE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE WILLIAM M. CONLEY

## APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Office of the United States Attorney BY: ELIZABETH ALTMAN Assistant United States Attorney 222 West Washington Avenue, Suite 700 Madison, Wisconsin 53703

For the Defendant:

Tracey Wood & Associates BY: JOSHUA HARGROVE 1 South Pinckney Street

Suite 950

Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Also appearing: ADRIAN C. GARDINER, Defendant

MARIAH STIEVE, U.S. Probation Officer

Jennifer L. Dobbratz, RMR, CRR, CRC U.S. District Court Federal Reporter United States District Court 120 North Henry Street, Rm. 410 Madison, Wisconsin 53703 (608) 261-5709

1 (Proceedings called to order at 1:14 p.m.) 2 THE CLERK: Case No. 19-CR-117-WMC, United States of America v. Adrian C. Gardiner, called for a sentencing. 3 May we have the appearances, please. 4 5 MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. The United 6 States appears by Elizabeth Altman. 7 MR. HARGROVE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mr. 8 Gardiner does appear via Zoom represented by counsel, Joshua 9 Hargrove. 10 THE COURT: Very good. We are here for the sentencing 11 of Adrian C. Gardiner, and I have to ask you, first, Mr. 12 Gardiner, to confirm that, despite improvements in COVID-19 in 13 Dane County, there continue to be risks in outlying counties and 14 obviously a risk until decided otherwise by health officials. 15 However, we are again meeting people in person in the courtroom 16 for other matters, and if you wished, we certainly would do so 17 again here and would bring you here to reassemble. However, 18 there remain good grounds not to require that, assuming that you 19 continue to wish to waive your personal appearance at sentencing 20 as indicated by the waiver filed by your counsel on your behalf. 21 Does that continue to be your desire, that is, that we 22 proceed today by videoconferencing? 2.3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And then, secondly, I do want

to confirm that you've had an opportunity to read and discuss

24

25

with your counsel the PSR and addendum to the PSR.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll turn to the government just to confirm that it is moving for an additional one-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility.

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that motion is granted. I also note that we appear to have at least -- well, I'm not certain who in addition to the victim but perhaps the victim, who could be shown in this call but initially I've chosen not to show her. She has every right to participate, but I'm not sure what her desires are, whether to simply watch or to actually address the Court, and I'll turn to the government's counsel for some guidance.

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

I know that Ms. Haynes-Porter, who is the victim's grandmother, wishes to address the Court. Ms. Paula Kedzie is also on Zoom. She submitted a letter to this court. She is the victim's social worker, and I don't know whether she wishes to add something in person or not, but I know that the victim's grandmother does.

THE COURT: I certainly have Ms. Kedzie's thoughtful memo and am taking it into consideration, but at the appropriate time in the government's presentation, I will turn to you, Ms. Altman, to indicate if the others wish to speak, at which point

anyone who asks to speak will then be displayed on the monitors. In fairness, particularly given the harm done to the victim, I want to make sure they understand that this is publicly available to view. I'm not sure how many viewers we actually have, but this is a public proceeding, and because it's not being held in court, it's available on YouTube to those who may wish to respond.

I also note that Ms. Kedzie has just written that she would like to speak as well, so at the appropriate time, we will have both individuals speaking.

In the meantime, I do want to address a couple other matters: first, restitution and where we stand and, secondly, the guidelines.

Ms. Altman, can you advise me as to the status of the restitution at this point?

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor. We have mentioned restitution to the victim's grandparent, who I believe right now is her guardian. We have not had time yet to have an in-depth conversation about that and would request that the Court leave it open.

THE COURT: All right. That's what I will do, and we will have that hearing on August 20th, 2021, at 1:00 p.m., unless the parties are able to reach an understanding before that time.

With those preliminaries, I will accept the plea agreement

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

finding that the offense of conviction adequately reflects the defendant's criminal conduct and the plea agreement does not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing. In determining the defendant's sentence, I will take into consideration the advisory sentencing guidelines and be governed by the statutory purposes of sentencing set forth at Section 3553(a) of Title 18.

As to the guidelines, while the government had no objection, the defendant did object to the application of the specific offense characteristic at Sections 2G2.1(b)(6)(A) and (B). Although the Sentencing Commission has called on Congress to change or remove this enhancement and, as defendant noted, this court also routinely grants downward departures where this enhancement might apply for reasons reflected in part E of the presentence report, it remains in the guideline manual and is, in the Court's view, appropriately applied in this case because, one, the defendant used his cellular phone under subsection (6)(A) to arrange for his travel to Wisconsin to engage in sexual conduct with a minor rather than simply to hold -- I shouldn't say simply, but to hold pornographic images, child pornography, as is normally before the Court, and, two, the enhancement is also applicable under subsection (b) (B) because the defendant represented to the same minor that he was 18 years old.

Moreover, while the defendant objected to Chapter Four -the Chapter Four enhancement at paragraph 41 of the presentence

2.3

report, he did so by citing Section 4B1.5(a)(1) when the applicable cite is to subsection (b)(1). Under subsection (b)(1), the defendant's relevant conduct establishes a pattern of prohibited sexual conduct by repeatedly traveling to Wisconsin to engage in sexual intercourse with Minor A, and these events occurred -- the fact that these events occurred as part of the instant offense involving the same victim, does not result in additional criminal convictions, is not a relevant factor as set forth in the applicable note, 4(B)(ii).

With those objections addressed, I, therefore, find the probation office calculated the advisory guidelines correctly using the current manual and taking into account all relevant conduct under Section 1B1.3.

The guideline for production of child pornography in violation of Section 2251(a) of Title 18 is found at Section 2G2.1. The base offense level is 32 under subsection 2.1(a), to which two levels are added under subsection 2.1(b)(1)(B) because Minor A had attained the age of 12 years but not yet attained the age of 16 years.

Two more levels are added under subsection 2.1(b)(2)(A) because the offense involved the commission of a sexual act or sexual contact. Specifically, as noted already, the defendant engaged in sexual intercourse with Minor A.

Another two levels apply under subsection 2.1(b)(3) because the defendant knowingly created a video of Minor A and

distributed it to Minor A.

2.3

Two final levels are added under subsections 2.1(b)(6)(A) and (b)(6)(B) because the defendant used a computer on an interactive computer service to solicit Minor A's participation in sexually explicit conduct and knowingly misrepresented his own age to persuade, induce, entice, and coerce her to engage in sexually explicit conduct. More specifically, the defendant used his cellular phone and various internet applications to meet Minor A and arrange for his travel to Wisconsin for the purpose of engaging in sexual contact with her while also representing that he was 18 years old.

While no other Chapter Two adjustments apply, the offense of conviction is a covered sex crime. The defendant engaged in a pattern involving prohibited sexual conduct. The defendant sexually assaulted Minor A on multiple separate occasions in the summer of 2019, and neither Section 4B1.1 as a career offender nor subsection (a) of Section 4B1.5 applies. Therefore, the defendant is considered a repeat dangerous child sex offender whose offense level shall be V under Section 4B1.5(b)(1) plus the offense level determined under Chapters Two and Three, making the applicable offense level 45.

The defendant qualifies for a three-level downward adjustment under Section 3E1.1 because he has demonstrated acceptance of responsibility for his offense and the government has moved for the additional reduction.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Accordingly, with a total offense level of 42 and a history category of I, the defendant ordinarily would have an advisory guideline imprisonment range of 360 months to life. However, the statutory authorized maximum sentence of 30 years is the same as the minimum of the applicable guideline range, meaning that the guideline term of imprisonment is 360 months under Section 5G1.1(a).

I note that, in the defendant's memorandum, that emphasis was placed on the fact that this defendant has no meaningful criminal history, I think a total of one point before these crimes, and that that should be a mitigating factor. willing to consider it. However, I'm not sure I can get to the sentence that either the defendant or, more inexplicably, the government is recommending, and it's principally because of the severity of the crimes that were committed. The Court has seldom had a defendant engage in more repeated horrendous conduct at the age of 41. I'm not even sure that's right. it was committed, I guess he would have been 41. To engage in this kind of repeated conduct with a 12-year-old, no matter what he told himself to begin with, and then to continue it when he knew himself how young she was, to do so by thwarting her foster parents for a clearly vulnerable victim, and to expose her to others who also raped her, it's just a horrendous set of facts, and at 41, now 42, I have a great deal of trouble not viewing the defendant as a continuing danger to society. The only

2.3

differences are what are pointed out by the defendant, fairly so, that his criminal history is very small -- but under the guidelines, that's already addressed by him being a category I -- and the fact that he doesn't appear to have circulated the videos that he made, which would further victimize this individual.

I am certainly taking into consideration seriously the agreement reached by the parties as to a recommended sentence, but this does not strike me as a mandatory minimum case given the egregious nature of the facts, and so I am struggling with an appropriate sentence, and I'm happy to hear from the government, although I've certainly read the memorandum provided. I'm not sure that the memorandum itself, except for asking for the agreed-upon 20 years, doesn't make a pretty good argument for why the Court should go above the mandatory minimum.

And with that, I'll hear from the government.

MS. ALTMAN: Your Honor, I don't have anything to add to my arguments. I would just ask that the Court listen to the victims at this time, starting with Ms. Haynes-Porter, if the Court would.

THE COURT: The only thing -- I'm happy to do that, Ms. Altman, but I am looking for something that would support your repeated assertion in your memorandum that 20 years would avoid unwarranted disparities and be sufficient but no greater than

2.3

necessary to accord with the purposes of sentencing. I know you agreed to make a recommendation of 20 years, but I can't think of a case where I hadn't gone above the mandatory minimum for a hands-on sexual assault of a minor. Maybe the only difference is this poor child was 12 instead of some of the more extreme age differentials, but, I mean, I'm really having trouble thinking of a case where someone was similarly situated where I adopted the 20-year minimum. And when you were making those statements, were you thinking of some case or cases in particular?

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I had cited two cases in my brief, the one with Mr. Kvatek, who was -- repeatedly sexually assaulted a girl who was 15, although she was -- did it more willfully, and then recently --

THE COURT: And also, just so we're clear, I thought that case involved -- was that a conviction for sexual assault or was it for possession of child pornography? What was he allowed to plead to?

MS. ALTMAN: I can double-check, Your Honor, quick while you do the rest of the hearing. It was either distribution or production, one of the two.

THE COURT: That's what I was thinking. Well, that's fine. And then --

MS. ALTMAN: The second case, Mr. Torres, he did plead to production, and he had the two victims with the hands-on

2.3

contact, if you recall, and that was 20 years, and that was what I was equivocating it toward because one of the victims in that case was 7.

THE COURT: And I'm trying to remember, there must have been some other extenuating cases. Was Mr. Ramirez [verbatim] to be immediately deported? There were other factors that caused me to come down to that number, and I apologize because, as you say, you did cite these, and I should have looked at them before proceeding today, but if you can provide me any other context with respect to that case as well, I would appreciate it.

And with that said, I am happy to hear from the victim representative as well as Ms. Kedzie, the lead social worker for the victim. Why don't we begin with the victim's grandmother, and if she's comfortable, I would ask that she be put on the screen. It's totally up to you whether you want to be seen or not.

MS. HAYNES-PORTER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. HAYNES-PORTER: -- I would like to have access to video.

THE COURT: Very good. And I can see you now as well.

MS. HAYNES-PORTER: But now I can't see you.

THE COURT: I wonder if perhaps you -- well, you couldn't have hit your video, so I'm not sure why that would be.

1 MS. HAYNES-PORTER: Okay. Now I can. 2 THE COURT: Is that better? 3 MS. HAYNES-PORTER: Yes. I can see you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Very good. Why don't you proceed with any 4 5 statement you wish to make. 6 MS. HAYNES-PORTER: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. 7 THE COURT: Good afternoon. MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon. 8 9 THE COURT: Go ahead. 10 MS. HAYNES-PORTER: I would like to talk to you about 11 the horrific and grotesque crime that Adrian Gardiner committed 12 against my granddaughter. It has changed her life forever. 13 spend countless hours, days, and months trying to help my 14 granddaughter piece back together her very fragile life. I have 15 been awakened from my sleep to the screams -- I'm sorry. THE COURT: No, no. There's no need to apologize, and 16 17 I can only imagine the pain that you're experiencing with your 18 granddaughter. Take your time, and I'm happy to hear anything 19 you wish to say. 20 MS. HAYNES-PORTER: My granddaughter violently fights 21 in her sleep while sweating profusely. I sometimes hold her in 22 my arms while trying to convince her that she's safe now, 2.3 reassure her that the monster -- that would be you, Mr. 24 Gardiner -- is not standing outside the window threatening to 25 kill us the way you did on that terrible night when she was at

2.3

another residence. I watch her jump when we're driving if a car gets too close to us. I suffer a great deal when she says certain males trigger her anxiety and make her have heinous flashbacks of the way she was so viciously violated. I'm sure that this is not the first time you've done this. You just got caught this time. I find myself making several trips throughout my home at night checking my doors, checking my windows. I'm afraid to even retrieve my car from my garage because I'm fearful that there may be someone just like you waiting to ambush me. You have successfully torn apart an entire family.

Your Honor, I hope that you sentence this man with the maximum time allowed. He does not deserve the privilege to be released. I beg of you, I implore you, please don't give him the chance to ruin another child's life. Hopefully you will afford my family the opportunity to breathe a small sigh of relief knowing that this man will hopefully die in jail.

THE COURT: And I --

MS. HAYNES-PORTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I can only tell you that I am certainly considering the incredible damage that the defendant's acts caused not just your granddaughter but her entire family, including you. As you know, the minimum sentence that I could impose, which is being recommended by the parties, is 20 years, so he's going to serve a lot of time, period, and he's going to be under a 30-year period of supervision involving federal

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

probation officers, who take their job quite seriously, especially when it comes to hands-on child sexual assault defendants.

More importantly, I know that your granddaughter is undergoing therapy, and I hope you don't give up on the value of that. It may take a long time, but she needs to get to the right therapist, and she needs to be open with the right therapist to process this over time. I don't mean to suggest for a moment she'll ever be the same person she was before, but the progress that can be made by a good therapist to help a child process this and move on with their life is pretty remarkable. So I hope you will constantly encourage her when she is down, when she is having these experiences, to pursue therapy, and if it's not working, then change therapists. There's someone out there who can help your daughter [verbatim] and, as importantly, can help you and the rest of your family, and at some point therapy that includes you, if you're that close with your granddaughter, as you obviously are, may help you see ways to assist in the processing and not to trigger the worse symptoms.

I know you love your granddaughter and that you're doing everything you can. The one thing you can't bring to the table is the objectivity of a trained therapist, and so I just encourage you -- this is the defendant's fault, all of this, but it doesn't mean that he gets to have the last word as to the

2.3

damage done to your granddaughter or to your family, and I hope, whatever the sentence is today, that this is the start of a period of healing, understanding it could be very long and the pain will always be there.

One thing I've learned -- I guess I knew this as a general matter before taking this job, but after more than 11 years on the job, I know the only way to really heal is to forgive, and that's an impossible ask for the victim or for her family in a case like this, but by God's grace, you may get there some day, and I hope that you all do and that the defendant recedes into the background of your lives rather than the prominence of it right now. I know it takes an awful lot of work to not just -- to even approach forgiveness. It takes a lot of work just to process what happened, but I hope that you and your family, and particularly your granddaughter, are able to do just that.

Unless there's anything more you wish to add, I'm happy to hear from Ms. Kedzie, the social worker who worked with your granddaughter.

MS. HAYNES-PORTER: Okay. I'm done. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I greatly appreciate you speaking today, and I guarantee you that it will be on my mind in considering an appropriate sentence today. Thank you.

MS. HAYNES-PORTER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Kedzie, I have read your memorandum.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

It was very well written, and it did paint a picture of the ways in which Mr. Gardiner made everyone's job harder and created the nightmare that he did, particularly not just for the victim but for the foster parents who were trying to protect her, but I'd be happy to hear anything else that you wish to add.

MS. KEDZIE: Sure, Your Honor. First is Nevaeh, she had wanted to attend this court hearing. I met with her and Guanita and another worker last week, and she wanted to attend. She was calling family members, encouraging them to attend. asked her mental health case manager if she and her mentor would help her write a letter to Your Honor, and she's not here because she's on the run. You know, like the very next day she ran away from her grandma -- well, she and her grandma got into a fight, you know, over supervision, you know, and then she went to one of our respite foster homes, you know, someone who has a lot of experience dealing with, you know, teenagers with difficult behaviors and mental health problems, and the next day she ran away from there. So that was about a week ago. We don't know where she is. She's not in contact with her grandma, with her mom, with any of us workers, sisters, aunts, uncles. The word is that she, you know, she found someone, a man, to pay her way to Chicago, you know. That's what we've heard through the grapevine.

The damage he's done to her is incalculable. I can't pronounce that word right now.

THE COURT: You got it right.

2.3

MS. KEDZIE: Okay. What we also had in place is in-home family therapy had just been starting. She was going to start horse therapy, which she was interested in. A mentor from a few years ago was back involved. One of the very best therapists here in Madison working with sexual abuse, Dawn Brubakken, was going to be starting with her in July, and so we really did have a good team developing, but she's been on the run for a week, and that follows her being on the run for five weeks prior, and this -- she wasn't a kid who ran away until she was sexually assaulted by Mr. Gardiner. She was -- she had problems, don't get me wrong. She lashed out at people physically and made threats and didn't trust people, but this behavior that started two years ago, you know, that was new, and it started with the sexual assaults. So I can't think of anything else to add.

THE COURT: I'm not sure there is anything more that can be added. I'm heartened to hear that you remain involved and hope that she eventually reaches out to someone who cares about her.

It may be, Ms. Haynes-Porter, that placement in some other setting is going to be necessary for her initially. I know that a victim coordinator through the government's office is available to assist as well. If there's anything that we can do at the court -- unfortunately, my principal task today is simply

2.3

sentencing, and it's a horribly blunt instrument. It doesn't change the harm that's been caused to the victim, and it doesn't guarantee that the defendant or others like him will not engage in similar conduct, but it's all I have, and I can assure you that I am keeping in mind both your memorandum and your comments today, and the victim will be -- and her family will be in my prayers, and I hope that she does step forward. I'm not sure this hearing will have any value. I don't think -- it's not permitted to be recorded, but if there's anything I can do down the line to assist, if we're lucky enough to get her back where people care about her, I would certainly do that. Thank you for your comments today.

At this point then I will hear from Mr. Hargrove.

Obviously, a lot has been said. I certainly don't view you as needing to respond to those who have spoken on behalf of the victim other than perhaps if there's something you wish to say regarding my comments or the government's comments, but you're welcome to make whatever additional statement you want, understanding that I have read with some care the memorandum that you already filed.

I'm not sure if you're speaking or not. Your mic is muted.

MR. HARGROVE: Yes, Your Honor. I can make a few comments, and I won't reverberate everything that was written in the PSR or in our sentencing memorandum, as the Court has made it clear that it's reviewed everything carefully.

2.3

I can tell the Court that I do believe that the leading aim, as has been thoroughly established in the sentencing, would be punishment, and I do believe that at the far end of this, no matter how long the Court incarcerates Mr. Gardiner, I also believe that a secondary, even a diminished aim, would still be rehabilitation for someone like Mr. Gardiner.

THE COURT: And I certainly agree that's the goal, and, fortunately, there are developing programs. They're certainly not there yet, but they're at least working hard to develop meaningful programs for those who engage in hands-on sexual offenses, and none of my comments were intended to indicate that I didn't think it was possible for the defendant to be rehabilitated. It's just an area that we have very little understanding of, and, fortunately, with careful supervision, it's generally been managed for those who have served, but there's obviously no guarantee since we don't really understand the motivation behind the crime itself.

MR. HARGROVE: And I completely agree with the Court. I just wanted to state I believe and, as someone who has had a number of conversations with Mr. Gardiner, I can tell the Court unequivocally that while he may never in his life be able to appreciate the impact and the devastation that he's caused her and her family, he definitely has an overwhelming amount of remorse, and he's taking responsibility for this, and I don't just say that as rhetoric. I say that because --

2.3

THE COURT: And, Ms. Haynes-Porter, I would just ask -you're welcome to stay on and be seen, but I wouldn't let
someone shake their head in the courtroom, and I would ask that
you not do that here. I know what your response is to this.
You don't need to shake your head to tell me the anguish that
these comments are, but I hope you realize that Mr. Hargrove has
an obligation to represent his client and to make appropriate
statements. If you find it difficult to maintain your
composure, which I understand, you can just do what has been
done by the social worker and simply remove the image. If you
wish to do that, I would understand it. But, otherwise, I do
have to ask you to at least not make demonstrations that are
distracting to my job, which is to hear from everyone. Thank
you for that.

I'm sorry, Mr. Hargrove, for interrupting. Go ahead.

MR. HARGROVE: Oh, no need, Your Honor.

I think it's clear from all counts and no one contests that this is an egregious case that's caused hurt all around, and I completely can state that Mr. Gardiner is truly accepting responsibility and accountability for his behavior. I believe his actions have caused hurt to everyone. As I stated in the sentencing memorandum, not only has it caused great devastation to the victim and her family, everything she may have to endeavor for the rest of her life, he did the same thing to his own family because of his own behavior. What his -- as I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

stated, that he was the primary caretaker for his mother, who is in her 70s, and she's had to do a number of things. She's had to have difficult conversations with people that's approached her on the street, and it's affected his family as well. So the sad part about cases like this is it really devastates everyone, and it really can't be understated how hurtful and harmful his behavior is.

The uphill task is to ask the Court to also look at other aspects of him, and that can be difficult in cases like this, and I believe the Court stated it earlier at the genesis of the hearing that it took into account the fact that he did not seek or attempt to circulate any videos and that he did accept responsibility, and I don't mean just by the plea. I mean, just as the PSR noted, when he had every incentive to try to deny how he met her on this site or that he knew her or that he traveled with her multiple times or even that he eventually became aware of her age and subsequently still began to engage with her, he admitted all of that, and I can say in my meager ten years of practice, that's not a common practice when people are first approached by law enforcement. And as difficult as it is, that's also another aspect of his character, that he took responsibility even when it was disincentivized for him at that point. And even in the PSR it notes that it was in a jail call where he told his mother what the issue was and that the victim was 12 years old and he subsequently engaged in sexual

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

intercourse with her and -- sexually assaulted. I want to state it candidly because she's a minor.

And so I also want that before the Court, that this was not someone, at least in this particular case, in this particular instance, that was simply looking for minors. The problem is that once he knew, he did not stop, and that's what was egregious. That's what was harmful. And as the Court noted, he also was not honest about his age. And so what I'm saying, sentence him specific to his character, the fact that he comes before the Court with a lack of criminal history, that he did take responsibility, that he continues to take responsibility, and that myself and the government have engaged in a number of conversations, and so it doesn't come lightly that we're making this recommendation to the Court. We're taking into account the effect and the fact that if after 20 years he is not able to conform his conduct to the expectations of the law, he goes back into incarceration. And as I stated in the sentencing memorandum, it's no small thing that he will most assuredly -when he is released, the person who is his biggest supporter and his biggest champion, his mother, will probably have passed because she's in her mid-70s. He won't see her again out of custody. He is now a felon, and he has a long time before him to be in custody, and so I ask the Court to look at those factors that are also punishment for him because of what he's done when it's deciding what his sentence is.

But it's for all of those reasons that I believe the 1 2 government's sentence and what we're joining in is appropriate 3 in this particular case. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hargrove. 4 5 Before I hear from the defendant, I'm going to ask Ms. 6 Altman to unmute and let me know if you were able to get any 7 more details or context as to those other two cases. 8 MS. ALTMAN: No, Your Honor. What I can tell you is 9 that Mr. Torres was not about to be deported. He was younger 10 than this defendant, and so perhaps that was the issue. He was 11 in his early 20s. 12 But I would like to also clarify one thing --13 THE COURT: So, in other words, the age differential 14 wasn't as extreme as it is here. Understood. 15 MS. ALTMAN: The mandatory minimum for this case is 15 years, and in --16 17 THE COURT: I apologize. 18 MS. ALTMAN: -- the sentencing memo, Mr. Hargrove 19 recommends 15 years. We're recommending 20. So I don't think 20 there is a joint recommendation, and we are not recommending the 21 mandatory minimum, and I just wanted to make sure --22 THE COURT: And I apologize for -- and I appreciate it, 2.3 and I should have noted --24 MR. HARGROVE: And that's correct, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: I should have noted the mandatory minimum

2.3

at the outset. Thank you for that. Thank you for that clarification.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: With that, I would be interested in anything that you wish to say to the Court, Mr. Gardiner.

THE DEFENDANT: I just want to apologize. I just want to apologize to the family that I affected. I'm totally sorry. I accept responsibility for what I did. Once I would have known her age, I should have stopped contact with her, and I take full responsibility for my actions, and I apologize to everybody involved.

THE COURT: And I hope you understand that under the Section 3553(a) factors, I do have to consider the harm that you did to this victim but also your decision to continue even when you knew the victim's age and even when you knew, and this is almost as inexplicable as your proceeding when you knew her actual age and sort of indicative of the fact that you must have known from the beginning that there was something very wrong here as a 41-year-old man to be in this kind of relationship at all, but is the fact that even when you knew you were under investigation, that the foster parents were trying to prevent any further engagement, that you continued to cause this child harm, and that I can't ignore that when thinking about an appropriate sentence.

THE DEFENDANT: I should have -- once I found out that

2.3

she was under the age of 18, I should have stopped all contact, and I just apologize for my actions, and it was wrong.

THE COURT: Age is one thing, but emotional immaturity is another, and you victimized this young girl, whatever you told yourself, and I have to consider that as well in thinking about not just a sentence but the danger that you continue to represent to society. I'm hopeful that we'll make more progress in understanding the motivations here, and I know that the programming in the federal system has gotten better in that regard. Given your criminal history, I would think that you'll probably be placed somewhere with programming for sexual offenders, and I hope you don't make the mistake of thinking that, "Well, I'm not like these other people," because you were pulled into behavior that is just indefensible, and you need to understand why you did what you did if you ever are going to have hope of stopping yourself from similar conduct. I hope you take advantage of whatever therapy is provided.

Unless you wish to add anything more, I am prepared to render sentence.

The defendant was raised in Chicago and Kansas City by his parents. Though he describes his childhood in positive terms and reported his parents had a good relationship, the defendant's brother describes their father as abusive and suffering from addictions to heroin and alcohol. The defendant also suffered multiple challenging losses throughout his early

2.3

childhood, which exacerbated his own mental health concerns over time. Despite reported support of his family, the defendant reported using alcohol to cope even before his arrest for the instant offense, and I suspect that there are deep-seated issues of denial for this defendant as to what he saw and experienced and how he was raised himself that he will have to get to the bottom of if he's ever going to dig his way out of this horrific crime. As for education, the defendant did not graduate high school but reportedly went on to earn a GED at age 30.

Moreover, information about the defendant's employment history is conflicting, providing no validated jobs, and his brother reported long-standing concerns for the defendant, indicating that he struggled to find stability in life. It was noted that the defendant seemed to be helping his grandmother, but that too is hard to quantify.

As for the offense of conviction, in the summer of 2019, the defendant met a 12-year-old female foster child online and communicated with her through various internet applications for several months portraying himself to be 18 years old with three foster siblings. The defendant communicated with the victim often and would travel to Wisconsin on numerous occasions to pick her up and transport her to parks and motels for the purpose of engaging in sexual intercourse. On several occasions the defendant also provided her with alcohol and refused to return her home when she requested. On one occasion the

2.3

defendant even brought three purported foster brothers with him, and those three also proceeded to have sexual intercourse with the child, apparently prompting the defendant to abandon her at the motel. The defendant further filmed his sexual encounters with the 12-year-old and sent one of the videos to her iPad, the purposes of which are both devastating and deeply concerning. Finally, despite learning the child was 12 years old and knowing law enforcement was aware of his illegal acts, the defendant persisted in contacting the victim and arranging additional meetings to have sex with her despite her foster parents' best efforts to prevent further sexual assaults.

Taking into consideration the nature of the offense as well as the defendant's personal history and characteristics, I am persuaded that a custodial sentence somewhere between the 20-year sentence recommended by the government and the 30-year maximum is reasonable and no greater than necessary to hold the defendant accountable, protect the community, provide the defendant the opportunity for rehabilitative programs, and achieve parity with sentences of similarly situated offenders who engage in sexual relationships with young children, record those encounters, and then distribute their illicit sexual encounters, albeit hopefully only to the victim. It is also intended to underscore that such individuals are dangerous sex offenders to minors and the need for our society to do better.

As to Count 1 of the indictment, it is adjudged that the

2.3

defendant is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 300 months, in other words, 25 years. During the period of incarceration, I recommend that the defendant receive sex offender treatment; substance abuse treatment, including RDAP; a mental health evaluation and recommended treatment; and be afforded prerelease placement in a residential re-entry center with work release privileges.

Although the defendant is in primary federal custody, he has a pending charge in Sauk County, Wisconsin, Circuit Court Case No. 20-CF-466. Under the Supreme Court's ruling in Setser v. United States, I have the discretion to impose a sentence that will run concurrently with or consecutively to any other sentence but will stand silent on the pending state case believing that the state judge is in the best position to decide if incremental punishment is appropriate in light of the sentence I imposed today.

The defendant's term of imprisonment is to be followed by a 30-year term of supervised release. He will be subject to the statutory mandatory conditions of supervision. In light of the nature of the offense and the defendant's personal history, I adopt Condition Nos. 1 through 25 as proposed and justified in the presentence report, noting that neither party has raised any objections to those proposals and that they will fulfill the goals of the Sentencing Reform Act. Specifically, as already noted, the defendant's conduct, involving multiple trips from

2.3

Indiana to Wisconsin during the summer of 2019 to have sexual intercourse with a 12-year-old female at parks and hotels after meeting and communicating with her online as well as him recording some of their sexual encounters and sending it to the child victim's iPad, demonstrate the substantial need for close supervision upon his release from custody, especially his persisting in that conduct even after learning the victim was 12 years of age and law enforcement was involved.

Acknowledging that the defendant's criminal history is limited to the one conviction for illegal transport of a firearm and one allegation of battery to a prisoner while detained, his education and employment history could not be verified, and his history of alcohol use to cope with diagnosed mental health conditions underscore something that he did not address with ongoing mental health treatment and never received substance abuse treatment demonstrate how crucial close supervision and assistance with education, job placement, alcohol and mental health treatment, and stable housing will be to his successful transition to a law-abiding life upon release.

In addition, the instant offense, although not drug related, mandatory drug testing as set forth in Section 3583(d) of Title 18 for supervision cases is not waived based on his history of marijuana and hallucinogens use as addressed in Condition No. 17.

As counsel is aware, the Seventh Circuit has continued to

2.3

leave open the possibility that this court should enter on the record each of the conditions verbatim and then justify them individually, and I'm happy to do so, unless the defense wishes to waive that recitation.

And I'm hoping we still have Mr. Hargrove, although I cannot quite see him on the screen. The question, Mr. Hargrove, is whether my justifications for the conditions of supervision are adequate or whether you want me to enter each of the conditions verbatim on the record and justify them individually, which I will --

MR. HARGROVE: I heard the Court. I believe the Court's colloquy thus far is adequate. I can answer any subsequent questions from my client.

THE COURT: Well, let me make sure, do you have any questions about the conditions that were set forth in the presentence report at this time, Mr. Gardiner?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I am afraid I am going to ask that you formally waive my going through each condition and justifying each of them, although I will incorporate that from the presentence report into my justifications today. Unless it's formally waived, I'll have to do that, which I will do. I'm not opposed to doing it, but it would have to be something you formally waive. Is that your desire?

MR. HARGROVE: Not without having a breakout with Mr.

```
1
       Gardiner if the Court wants a formal waiver.
 2
                THE COURT: Then I'm afraid that, as I read the Seventh
 3
       Circuit case law, that's what we'll need to do. I'm not -- I
       want to be clear: I'm not requiring you to waive it, and I have
 4
 5
       the conditions in front of me, and I'm happy to walk through
 6
       each of them and justify them individually, understanding there
 7
       are 25 set forth in the presentence report in some detail and
       that I would justify each of them.
 8
 9
            If you want to break out for that discussion, go ahead.
10
                MR. HARGROVE: Yes, very briefly. It will only take a
11
       minute or two. If I can just have a breakout.
12
                THE COURT: Sure. We will do that. Very good.
13
            And, Mr. Gardiner, you'll be passed into a separate room as
14
       well in a moment. I hope. And why don't we go off the record
15
       at this time.
16
                 (Discussion held off the record.)
17
                THE COURT: With that said, we'll go back on the record
       at this time, I believe.
18
19
                THE CLERK: No. I think he just finally went into the
20
       room.
21
                THE COURT: Okay.
22
            (Pause in proceedings from 2:12 p.m. until 2:14 p.m.)
23
                THE COURT: All right. We'll go back on the record.
                                                                       Ι
24
       think we might have --
25
                THE CLERK: We're still waiting for --
```

1 THE COURT: -- lost defense counsel for a moment, but 2 we're back on the record. As soon as we have Mr. Hargrove, you 3 can address the Court. I hope we get him back. There we are. MR. HARGROVE: Yes. I apologize, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: We're back on the record. Sorry. ahead. We're back on the record. 6 7 MR. HARGROVE: Forgive me. I didn't mean to cut off 8 the Court. 9 I did speak with my client, and I believe we are fine 10 waiving the reading of those conditions in court today. 11 THE COURT: And is that correct, Mr. Gardiner? 12 THE DEFENDANT: (Muted). 13 THE COURT: You have your mute on. I don't know if 14 that was intentional or not. Hopefully you can -- yes, there 15 you go. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. 18 With that said, I do want to emphasize for Mr. Gardiner, 19 since this will be a very long time, that you appreciate any 20 condition I've imposed today may no longer be appropriate when 21 you're released. If that's the case, you should work with your 22 probation officer to reach agreement on amendments that will 2.3 have to be brought back to the Court, whether it's to me or some 24 other federal judge who would consider the merits of it. Even

if the probation officer doesn't agree, you can petition the

25

Court for amendments at the time of your release.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

It is adjudged the defendant is to pay a \$100 criminal assessment penalty to the Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, which is required by statute and immediately due following sentencing. I do encourage the defendant to make that payment if possible. If not, then at least to do the check off so that he is not precluded from any programming as a result while confined in the federal prison system.

The victim in this case has not yet made a specific request for restitution. However, as noted in the plea agreement, the defendant has agreed to pay restitution, and so by request of the government's counsel, I have set over for a restitution hearing on August 20th of this year at 1:00 p.m. consideration of an appropriate restitution amount in addition to any other criminal penalties, restitution, or special assessment authorized by law the Court is directed to assess while not more than \$17,000 for any person convicted of an offense under Section 2252(a)(4) of Title 18 or Section 2252A(a)(5) and not more than \$35,000 for any person convicted of any other offense for trafficking in child pornography; finally, not more than \$50,000 for any person convicted of child pornography production offenses. The Court will consider factors under Section 3553(a) and Section 3572 both of Title 18 when ordering this assessment, but I will defer as to the amount consistent with the request of

2.3

the parties. The defendant is -- well, I'm just going to defer on that.

I do find at this point that the defendant lacks the economic resources to allow him to make full payment of restitution in the foreseeable future, so I will set a nominal payment to begin 30 days from his release from custody at the appropriate time.

The defendant is to notify the United States Attorney

General and this court of any material change in his economic

circumstances that might affect his ability to pay restitution.

Finally, in addition to whatever restitution is ordered, I find that the defendant would lack the means to pay a further fine under Section 5E1.2(c) without impairing his ability to support himself upon release from custody.

And a final order of forfeiture will be granted for the property seized from the defendant as reflected in the forfeiture order in accordance with Section 2253 of Title 18.

Based on the offense of conviction, the defendant is required to pay a \$5,000 assessment under the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 unless indigent. However, I again find that he is indigent, and this assessment is waived.

The probation office is to notify local law enforcement agencies and the state attorney general of the defendant's release back to the community.

In the event that the parties do reach agreement on

restitution, I will, under Section 3664(f)(3)(B), require the defendant to at least begin making nominal payments of a minimum of \$100 each month beginning within 30 days of his release.

With that said, I understand that there are additional counts to be dismissed at this time under the plea agreement?

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor, and I would so move.

THE COURT: Those counts, I believe, 2 through 4, but, regardless, the remaining counts against this defendant are dismissed.

I will ask, Mr. Hargrove, for you to confirm that I've sufficiently addressed the defendant's main arguments in mitigation today.

MR. HARGROVE: Yes.

2.3

THE COURT: Then, finally, I want to emphasize for you, Mr. Gardiner, you have a right to appeal this court's sentence. It is — it has not been arrived at lightly, but in addition to your plea, you can challenge the sentence by filing a notice of appeal. You only have 14 days to do that, so you should discuss it with Mr. Hargrove, who I'm confident would assist you in filing the notice, although someone else may be appointed to represent you on appeal.

With that, I can only say that I realize this sentence is not going to be satisfying to the victim or her family nor obviously to the defendant, but I've tried to weigh the harm done and the requirements of the statute in sentencing and also

hope that the defendant is able to gain insights as to how he managed to justify in his own mind the conduct for which he has now been sentenced.

With that said, I believe we are in recess, unless there's something more for the government?

MS. ALTMAN: Nothing, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Or for the defendant.

MR. HARGROVE: Just, Your Honor -- I might have missed it -- do we need to establish credit?

THE COURT: Normally that's done by the Bureau of Prisons itself.

MR. HARGROVE: Okay.

2.3

THE COURT: Assuming he was in custody, which I believe he was, federal custody while held, all of that would be applied against his federal sentence. The only portion that would not be applied would be if he were to have been held at some point in state custody and an actual sentence is imposed in this case.

Officer Stieve, for the benefit of the defendant, do you know roughly how much credit he'll have against his sentence?

OFFICER STIEVE: I don't, Your Honor, only that he's been in federal custody.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hargrove, you're welcome to come back to the Court if there's a problem with the calculation by the Bureau of Prisons, but typically they're pretty receptive to an award of full credit. Given that the defendant has 25

```
years ahead of him, there will, sadly, be plenty of time to
 1
 2
       address that if not.
 3
             With that said, I am going to recess, and I do hope, Mr.
       Gardiner, you're able to find some semblance of understanding
 4
 5
       and grace in your future. We are in recess.
 6
                 MS. ALTMAN: Thank you.
 7
                 THE CLERK: This court stands in recess.
 8
             (Proceedings concluded at 2:23 p.m.)
                                     * * *
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I, JENNIFER L. DOBBRATZ, Certified Realtime and Merit 1 2 Reporter in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that the 3 foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings held on the 15th day of June, 2021, before the Honorable 4 5 William M. Conley, U.S. District Judge for the Western District 6 of Wisconsin, in my presence and reduced to writing in 7 accordance with my stenographic notes made at said time and 8 place. 9 Dated this 28th day of October, 2021. 10 11 12 1.3 14 15 \_/s/ Jennifer L. Dobbratz\_ 16 Jennifer L. Dobbratz, RMR, CRR, CRC Federal Court Reporter 17 18 19 20 21 22 2.3 24 The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter. 25